



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/589,666	06/08/2000	Baljeet Singh Baweja	AUS9-2000-0234.US1	9874
7590	04/26/2004		EXAMINER	
International Business Machines Corporation Intellectual Property Law Department Internal Zip 4054 11400 Burnet Road Austin, TX 78758			SMITH, PETER J	
			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			2176	
DATE MAILED: 04/26/2004				

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

X

Office Action Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
	09/589,666	BAWEJA ET AL.	

Examiner	Art Unit	
Peter J Smith	2176	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on 17 February 2004.
- 2a) This action is **FINAL**. 2b) This action is non-final.
- 3) Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) Claim(s) 1-34 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) Claim(s) 1-34 is/are rejected.
- 7) Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) The drawing(s) filed on 08 June 2000 is/are: a) accepted or b) objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
 - a) All b) Some * c) None of:
 1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- 1) Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____.
- 4) Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____.
- 5) Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
- 6) Other: _____.

DETAILED ACTION

1. This action is responsive to communications: application filed on 06/08/2000, IDS filed on 09/11/2000.
2. Objection to claims 20, 22, and 24 has been dropped as necessitated by the amendment.
3. Claims 1-34 are pending in the case. Claims 1, 4, 9, 14, 19, 21, and 23 are independent claims.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

4. **Claims 1-34 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Kikinis, US 6,076,109 filed 01/30/1997 in view of Donoho et al.(hereafter referred to as Donoho), US 6,604,130 B2 continuation of application filed 3/19/1999.**

Regarding independent claim 1, Kikinis teaches HTML, a first set of natural language data, with a first set of tags, conveying a first version of the information of a particular content displayable to users at said display stations in fig. 4 and col. 2 lines 32-67. Kikinis teaches HTL, a condensed version of HTML and thus a second set of natural language data, with a second set of tags, conveying a second version of condensed displayable information of the same particular

content displayable to users of personal palm-type display computers connected to remote locations in fig. 4 and col. 2 lines 32-67.

Kikinis teaches that both sets of natural language data and identifying tags are available to the same computer, the proxy server, but does not teach that the two sets of natural language are combined and contained within the same markup language document file. Donoho teaches combining two version of the data content within one file and allowing the destination to choose the appropriate display method in col. 22 lines 15-21. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to have used this technique of creating the alternates before the file is requested to have modified Kikinis with the teachings of Donoho to have completed the work done by the proxy server before the HTML request was received and to have combined the two versions of the web page into one file allowing the destination computer to have chosen the display alternative. This would have allowed the requesting browser to have received the requested data faster because the conversion of the full HTML to the reduced quality HTML would have already been performed and all that would have been required at that point would have been to have transmitted the data to the client computer.

Regarding dependent claims 2 and 3, Kikinis teaches natural language data which comprises text and image data in fig. 4 and col. 10 lines 37-40.

Regarding independent claim 4 and dependent claim 5, Kikinis teaches HTML, a first set of natural language data, with a first set of tags, conveying a first version of the information of a particular content displayable to users at said display stations in fig. 4 and col. 2 lines 32-67. Kikinis teaches HTL, a condensed version of HTML and thus a second set of natural language data, with a second set of tags, conveying a second version of condensed displayable information

of the same particular content displayable to users of personal palm-type display computers connected to remote locations in fig. 4 and col. 2 lines 32-67. Kikinis teaches a means for accessing the second set of natural language data from a received Hypertext Markup Language document in fig. 4 and col. 2 lines 32-67.

Kikinis teaches that both sets of natural language data and identifying tags are available to the same computer, the proxy server, but does not teach that the two sets of natural language are combined and contained within the same markup language document file. Donoho teaches combining two version of the data content within one file and allowing the destination to choose the appropriate display method in col. 22 lines 15-21. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to have used this technique of creating the alternates before the file is requested to have modified Kikinis with the teachings of Donoho to have completed the work done by the proxy server before the HTML request was received and to have combined the two versions of the web page into one file allowing the destination computer to have chosen the display alternative. This would have allowed the requesting browser to have received the requested data faster because the conversion of the full HTML to the reduced quality HTML would have already been performed and all that would have been required at that point would have been to have transmitted the data to the client computer.

Regarding dependent claim 6, Kikinis teaches a browser associated with the personal palm computer and a means responsive to the second set of tags to transmit the second set of natural language data to the personal palm computer in fig. 4, col. 2 lines 32-67, and col. 8 lines 16-52.

Regarding dependent claim 7, Kikinis teaches a receiving display station associated with a personal palm-type display computer and a means whereby the personal palm computer accesses the World Wide Web through the receiving display station in fig. 4, col. 2 lines 32-67 and col. 8 lines 16-52.

Regarding dependent claim 8, Kikinis teaches a means responsive to said second set of tags to transmit the second set of natural language data to the personal palm computer in fig. 4, col. 2 lines 32-67, and col. 8 lines 16-52.

Regarding independent claim 9 and dependent claim 10, Kikinis teaches HTML, a first set of natural language data, with a first set of tags, conveying a first version of the information of a particular content displayable to users at said display stations in fig. 4 and col. 2 lines 32-67. Kikinis teaches HTL, a condensed version of HTML and thus a second set of natural language data, with a second set of tags, conveying a second version of condensed displayable information of the same particular content displayable to users of personal palm-type display computers connected to remote locations in fig. 4 and col. 2 lines 32-67. Kikinis teaches a means for accessing the second set of natural language data from a received Hypertext Markup Language document in fig. 4 and col. 2 lines 32-67.

Kikinis teaches that both sets of natural language data and identifying tags are available to the same computer, the proxy server, but does not teach that the two sets of natural language are combined and contained within the same markup language document file. Donoho teaches combining two version of the data content within one file and allowing the destination to choose the appropriate display method in col. 22 lines 15-21. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to have used this technique of creating the

alternates before the file is requested to have modified Kikinis with the teachings of Donoho to have completed the work done by the proxy server before the HTML request was received and to have combined the two versions of the web page into one file allowing the destination computer to have chosen the display alternative. This would have allowed the requesting browser to have received the requested data faster because the conversion of the full HTML to the reduced quality HTML would have already been performed and all that would have been required at that point would have been to have transmitted the data to the client computer.

Regarding dependent claim 11, Kikinis teaches accessing the World Wide Web through a browser including the step of transmitting the second set of natural language data to a personal palm computer responsive to the second set of tags in fig. 4, col. 2 lines 32-67, and col. 8 lines 16-52.

Regarding dependent claim 12, Kikinis teaches accessing the World Wide Web by a personal palm computer through an associated receiving display station in fig. 4, col. 2 lines 32-67, and col. 8 lines 16-52.

Regarding dependent claim 13, Kikinis teaches transmitting a second set of natural language data to a personal palm computer responsive to a second set of tags in fig. 4, col. 2 lines 32-67, and col. 8 lines 16-52.

Regarding independent claim 14 and dependent claim 15, Kikinis teaches HTML, a first set of natural language data, with a first set of tags, conveying a first version of the information of a particular content displayable to users at said display stations in fig. 4 and col. 2 lines 32-67. Kikinis teaches HTL, a condensed version of HTML and thus a second set of natural language data, with a second set of tags, conveying a second version of condensed

displayable information of the same particular content displayable to users of personal palm-type display computers connected to remote locations in fig. 4 and col. 2 lines 32-67. Kikinis teaches a means for accessing the second set of natural language data from a received Hypertext Markup Language document in fig. 4 and col. 2 lines 32-67.

Kikinis teaches that both sets of natural language data and identifying tags are available to the same computer, the proxy server, but does not teach that the two sets of natural language are combined and contained within the same markup language document file. Donoho teaches combining two version of the data content within one file and allowing the destination to choose the appropriate display method in col. 22 lines 15-21. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to have used this technique of creating the alternates before the file is requested to have modified Kikinis with the teachings of Donoho to have completed the work done by the proxy server before the HTML request was received and to have combined the two versions of the web page into one file allowing the destination computer to have chosen the display alternative. This would have allowed the requesting browser to have received the requested data faster because the conversion of the full HTML to the reduced quality HTML would have already been performed and all that would have been required at that point would have been to have transmitted the data to the client computer.

Regarding dependent claim 16, Kikinis teaches a means responsive to a second set of tags to transmit a second set of natural language data to a personal palm computer in col. 8 lines 16-52.

Regarding dependent claim 17, Kikinis teaches a receiving display station associated with a personal palm-type display computer and a means whereby the personal palm computer accesses the World Wide Web through a receiving display station in fig. 4 and col. 2 lines 32-67.

Regarding dependent claim 18, Kikinis teaches a means responsive to a second set of tags to transmit a second set of natural language data to a personal palm computer in fig. 4, col. 2 lines 32-67, and col. 8 lines 16-52.

Regarding independent claim 19 and dependent claim 20, Kikinis teaches HTML, a first set of natural language data, with a first set of tags, conveying a first version of the information of a particular content displayable to users at said display stations in fig. 4 and col. 2 lines 32-67. Kikinis teaches HTL, a condensed version of HTML and thus a second set of natural language data, with a second set of tags, conveying a second version of condensed displayable information of the same particular content displayable to users of personal palm-type display computers connected to remote locations in fig. 4 and col. 2 lines 32-67.

Kikinis teaches that both sets of natural language data and identifying tags are available to the same computer, the proxy server, but does not teach that the two sets of natural language are combined and contained within the same markup language document file. Donoho teaches combining two version of the data content within one file and allowing the destination to choose the appropriate display method in col. 22 lines 15-21. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to have used this technique of creating the alternates before the file is requested to have modified Kikinis with the teachings of Donoho to have completed the work done by the proxy server before the HTML request was received and to have combined the two versions of the web page into one file allowing the destination computer

to have chosen the display alternative. This would have allowed the requesting browser to have received the requested data faster because the conversion of the full HTML to the reduced quality HTML would have already been performed and all that would have been required at that point would have been to have transmitted the data to the client computer.

Regarding independent claim 21 and dependent claim 22, Kikinis teaches HTML, a first set of natural language data, with a first set of tags, conveying a first version of the information of a particular content displayable to users at said display stations in fig. 4 and col. 2 lines 32-67. Kikinis teaches HTL, a condensed version of HTML and thus a second set of natural language data, with a second set of tags, conveying a second version of condensed displayable information of the same particular content displayable to users of personal palm-type display computers connected to remote locations in fig. 4 and col. 2 lines 32-67.

Kikinis teaches that both sets of natural language data and identifying tags are available to the same computer, the proxy server, but does not teach that the two sets of natural language are combined and contained within the same markup language document file. Donoho teaches combining two version of the data content within one file and allowing the destination to choose the appropriate display method in col. 22 lines 15-21. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to have used this technique of creating the alternates before the file is requested to have modified Kikinis with the teachings of Donoho to have completed the work done by the proxy server before the HTML request was received and to have combined the two versions of the web page into one file allowing the destination computer to have chosen the display alternative. This would have allowed the requesting browser to have received the requested data faster because the conversion of the full HTML to the reduced

quality HTML would have already been performed and all that would have been required at that point would have been to have transmitted the data to the client computer.

Regarding independent claim 23 and dependent claim 24, Kikinis teaches HTML, a first set of natural language data, with a first set of tags, conveying a first version of the information of a particular content displayable to users at said display stations in fig. 4 and col. 2 lines 32-67. Kikinis teaches HTL, a condensed version of HTML and thus a second set of natural language data, with a second set of tags, conveying a second version of condensed displayable information of the same particular content displayable to users of personal palm-type display computers connected to remote locations in fig. 4 and col. 2 lines 32-67. Kikinis teaches a means for accessing the second set of natural language data from a received Hypertext Markup Language document in fig. 4 and col. 2 lines 32-67.

Kikinis teaches that both sets of natural language data and identifying tags are available to the same computer, the proxy server, but does not teach that the two sets of natural language are combined and contained within the same markup language document file. Donoho teaches combining two version of the data content within one file and allowing the destination to choose the appropriate display method in col. 22 lines 15-21. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to have used this technique of creating the alternates before the file is requested to have modified Kikinis with the teachings of Donoho to have completed the work done by the proxy server before the HTML request was received and to have combined the two versions of the web page into one file allowing the destination computer to have chosen the display alternative. This would have allowed the requesting browser to have received the requested data faster because the conversion of the full HTML to the reduced

quality HTML would have already been performed and all that would have been required at that point would have been to have transmitted the data to the client computer.

Regarding dependent claims 25-28, Kikinis teaches at least one additional set of natural language data conveying an additional version of condensed displayable information of the same particular content displayable to users of other personal palm-type display computers connected to remote locations and at least one additional set of tags identifying at least one additional set of natural language data in fig. 4 and col. 2 lines 32-67.

Regarding dependent claims 29-32, Kikinis teaches a first set of natural language data which includes a portion of a second set of natural language data in fig. 4 and col. 2 lines 32-67.

Regarding dependent claim 33, Kikinis teaches a proxy server associated with a browser for transmitting proxy condensed versions of Web HTML document to personal palm-type computer and a means for overriding proxy servers to thereby permit the accessing by palm-type computers of a second set of natural language data conveying a second version of condensed displayable data in fig. 4 and col. 2 lines 32-67.

Regarding dependent claim 34, Kikinis teaches normally providing a condensed version of Web HTML documents to personal palm-type computers and overriding proxy servers to thereby permit the accessing by palm-type computer of a second set of natural language data conveying a second version of condensed displayable data in fig. 4 and col. 2 lines 32-67.

Response to Arguments

5. Applicant's arguments, see pages 14-16, filed 2/17/2004, with respect to the rejection(s) of claim(s) 1-34 under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Kikinis, US

6,076,109 filed 01/30/1997 have been fully considered and are persuasive. Therefore, the rejection has been withdrawn. However, upon further consideration, a new ground(s) of rejection is made under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Kikinis, US 6,076,109 filed 01/30/1997 in view of Donoho et al.(hereafter referred to as Donoho), US 6,604,130 B2 continuation of application filed 3/19/1999. Kikinis teaches having two sets of natural language data and two sets of identifying tags. What Kikinis does not teach is combining these two sets into one markup language file. Kikinis performs the creation of the reduced quality natural language data and identifying tags upon request of the browsing device, whereas Applicant performs the creation of the reduced quality natural language data and identifying tags before the information is requested by the browsing device. The Examiner believes Donoho contains the teachings which would have allowed one of ordinary skill in the art to have modified Kikinis to have performed the creation of reduced quality natural language data and identifying tags and to have combined them with the original natural language data and identifying tags into one file and to have provided this file to the browsing device in a manner which would have allowed the browsing device to have indicated the preferred alternative of display data.

Conclusion

6. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Peter J Smith whose telephone number is 703-305-5931. The examiner can normally be reached on Mondays-Fridays 7:00am-3:30pm.

Art Unit: 2176

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Joseph H Feild can be reached on 703-305-9792. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

PJS
April 20, 2004


JOSEPH FEILD
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER